DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 122 473 EC 082 851

AUTHOR Berdine, William H.; And Others
TITLE Competency Based Teacher Education: A Workshop on Competency Based Instructional Formats.
PUB DATE Apr 76
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual International Convention, The Council for Exceptional Children (54th, Chicago, Illinois, April 4-9, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Objectives; Exceptional Child Education; *Handicapped Children; *Individualized Instruction; Inservice Teacher Education; Instructional Media; *Performance Based Teacher Education; Post Secondary Education; Programed Instruction; Special Education; *Teacher Educator Education; *Workshops

ABSTRACT

Outlined is a 4-hour workshop presentation designed to teach 40 to 50 university special education teacher training personnel and coordinators of public school inservice programs to write competency based instructional formats. In addition to an overview and status report of competency based teacher education (CBTE), sessions are explained to offer content modules in three formats: mediated module (videotape and programmed narrative), auto-instructional module (published journal article), and a self-paced program narrative module. Specified for each session are competency, rationale, objectives, evaluation procedures and criteria, learning activities and alternatives, and detailed content outline. Sample competencies cited for workshop participants are designing and producing a mediated CBTE module to match an instructional objective, and demonstrating knowledge of new or innovative CBTE programs and trends in federal funding and research emphasis. Examples of evlauation instruments are included. (CL)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED122473

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COMPETENCY BASED TEACHER EDUCATION

A WORKSHOP

ON

COMPETENCY BASED INSTRUCTIONAL FORMATS

BY

Co-Leaders: William H. Berdine, D.Ed.
Patricia T. Cegelka, Ed.D.
University of Kentucky

Introductory Speaker: Patricia A. Morrissey, Ph.D.
Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped
University of Indiana

Presentors: Jill C. Dardig, Ed.D.
Russell Sage College

Patricia A. Morrissey, Ph.D.
Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped
University of Indiana

John R. Moyer, Ph.D.
Russell Sage College

C. Michael Nelson, Ed.D.
University of Kentucky

Evaluators: H. Earle Knowlton, M.Ed.
Alan J. Siegel, B.S.
Patricia J. Hoessli, MSE
Constance L. Cundiff, M.A.
(Advanced Graduate Students)
University of Kentucky

April 6, 1976
54th Annual International Convention
The Council for Exceptional Children
Teacher Education Division

EC098951

I. Purpose of Workshop:

The objective of the workshop is to develop expertise in writing competency-based instructional formats of instruction. To achieve this, content modules covering three instructional formats are offered on a rotating basis. These include:

1. Mediated Module Format: A module which utilizes a mediated format (video tape) and programmed narrative.

2. Auto-Instructional Module Format (Published Narrative): A self-pacing module utilizing a journal article.

3. Auto-Instructional Format (Programmed Narrative): A self-pacing module utilizing a professor-written programmed narrative.

Additionally, a fourth module titled Mastery Sessions is offered for those workshop participants with fairly extensive experience in CBI module development but who are interested in a more global look at the status of CBTE programming in special education. The Mastery Session is divided equally into two 45 minute segments. It is designed for those who would like an overview of CBTE in special education. The first segment will be a discussion of the need for new directions in federal support and research priorities; and the second segment will be an operational game in which participating teams generate an evaluation checklist for those considering the development/implementation of a CBTE program.

[Prior to participation in the above modules, an informational session will be given on CBTE programs around the country.]

II. Workshop Participants:

40-50 College and University teacher training personnel and coordinators of public school in-service programs.

III. Time of Workshop:

Four hours (9:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.)

IV. Workshop Evaluation:

In order to provide staff with data measuring the overall impact of the CBI workshop, the following evaluation procedure will be implemented. First, participants will be asked to provide feedback following each module by completing the Between Session Questionnaire. This will provide staff with data appropriate to any immediate change needs of a particular module. Secondly, immediately upon completion of the workshop, participants will be asked to fill out the Post-Session Questionnaire. This data will provide the staff with relevant information concerning the overall impact of the workshop. Third, during each module, staff will unobtrusively observe the operations of that module in terms of group leader-group interaction. One purpose of this Observation form will be to provide group leaders with additional feedback concerning any changes in the operation of the module.

Finally, the Long-Term Questionnaire (not provided) will be sent to each participant approximately four months after the workshop to measure long-term impact and retention. We feel this procedure will give us the feedback needed to improve the quality of future workshops in CBI. Every effort will be made by staff to ensure that these procedures will not unduly distract participants of the workshop.

V. Workshop Procedures:

9:00-9:20 Introduction - Bill Berdine
9:20-9:50 Status Report of CBTE Training Programs - Pat Morrissey
9:50-10:00 Self-selection Procedures - Pat Cegelka

After skimming the packet of materials and listening to the overview by Pat Morrissey, each individual will have the option of choosing the

instructional modules most appropriate to his/her level of experience, interest, and future utilization of CBTE.

Three formats (Textbook Format, Instructor Written Narrative Format, and Mediated Format) will be conducted during all time blocks. Alternatives I, II and III list the three preplanned sequences for attending those formats. Alternative IV is to attend any one of the three format sessions followd by a 2-part mastery session on CBTE. Those attending the mastery format must opt to attend both parts.

ALTERNATIVES

	I	II	III	IV
10:15-11:00	A CBI Textbook Format (Auto-Instructional) (Nelson)	B CBI Narrative Format (Auto-Instructional) (Moyer)	C CBI Mediated Format (Auto-Instructional) (Dardig)	A, B, or C Personal Option
11:15-12:00	B CBI Narrative Format (Auto-Instructional) (Moyer)	C CBI Mediated Format (Auto-Instructional) (Dardig)	A CBI Textbook Format (Auto-Instructional) (Nelson)	Mastery Session (Pat Morrissey) Part I - CBTE in Special Education Part II - An Operational Game
12:15 1:00	C CBI Mediated Format (Auto-Instructional) (Dardig)	A CBI Textbook Format (Auto-Instructional) (Nelson)	B CBI Narrative Format (Auto-Instructional) (Moyer)	

(1:00-1:30 - Final Evaluation)

INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS	PROGRAM	NUMBER	PAGE
	CBTE-Workshop	1a	1 of 5

COMPONENT	MODULE
CBTE-Overview Session (Pat Morrissey)	Status Report of CBTE Training Programs

COMPETENCY

The participant will be able to demonstrate knowledge of the current status of 18 CBTE programs in Special Education as surveyed by the Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped (CITH), The University of Indiana.

RATIONALE

A thorough knowledge of the current status of CBTE programs is essential to the continued development of existing programs and particularly for the design and implementation of new programs.

OBJECTIVES

1. To describe the scope of the CBTE review project in terms of the sample surveyed by CITH.
   a. Degree granting programs
   b. Combined training and child service programs
   c. Inservice training programs
   d. Programs employing workshops and modules
2. To summarize trends and implications across the sample in terms of program descriptors.
   a. Reflection of trends from the larger special education community
   b. Level of training
   c. Integration of knowledge and skills
   d. Training environments
   e. Use of modules
3. To synthesize evidence of correspondence with a CBTE format
   a. Competency selection
   b. Specification of mastery levels
   c. Progression through program
   d. Implied/related CBTE criteria
4. To critically assess program evaluation data in terms of the following:
   a. Variability
   b. Content
   c. Results
   d. Formats
   e. Implications

Prerequisites

NONE

The participant will be evaluated concerning the process aspects of the module but not specific product assessment will be made, i.e., posttest.

The evaluation procedures will be the same as outlined in the Evaluation of Workshop handout attached to the workshop packet.

LEARNING ACTIVITIES AND ALTERNATIVES

The information dissemination will consist of lecture/discussion and explanation of graphic data displays.

Descriptions of CBTE training programs: A status report on CBTE in special education

I. The sample

A. Degree granting programs

1. Florida State University, Tallahassee
2. Indiana University, Bloomington
3. University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls
4. University of Texas, Austin
5. University of Vermont, Burlington

B. Combined training and child-service programs

1. University of Georgia, Athens
2. University of Minnesota, Seward Project, Minneapolis

C. Inservice training programs

1. Montgomery County School District, Rockville, Maryland
2. Huston Independent School District, Texas
3. University of Idaho, Pocatello
4. Ohio: EMR Program Development, "HELPS"

D. Programs employing workshops and modules

1. University of Connecticut, Storrs
2. Southern Illinois University, Carbondale
3. University of Kansas, Lawrence
4. University of Missouri, Columbia
5. State University College, Buffalo, New York
6. Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois
7. Olathe United School District, Olathe, Kansas

II. Trends and Implications

A. Program description data

1. Reflect trends evident in larger special education community
   a. Mainstreaming
   b. Noncategorical training
   c. Diagnostic-prescriptive teaching
2. Level of training
   a. Undergraduate with extention to master's level allows more time for program refinement and coordination
   b. Inservice programs probably on increase but not yet formalized.
3. Integration of knowledge and skills
   a. Difficult to accomplish
   b. Coursework and practica simultaneously facilitates integration.

4. Training environments
   a. Not that different from traditional
   b. Few have systematic gradation of instructional responsibility
      (1) Tutoring
      (2) Small group
      (3) Entire class
5. Use of modules
   a. Difficult to determine
      (1) Time and costs prohibitive
      (2) Most reflect a transitional stage

B. Evidence of correspondence with a CBTE format

1. Competency selection
   a. Come from authoritative-source base
   b. Subject to review
2. Specification of mastery levels
   a. Very difficult
   b. Artificial/isolated assessment criteria used for easy record keeping
   c. Performance criteria arbitrarily determined
   d. Reflects the need for an empirical base/strategies in teacher behavior research
3. Progression through program
   a. Flexible time limits, can accomodate many needs
4. Implied and related CBTE criteria
   a. Individualization and feedback achieved to various degrees
   b. Systematic, modularized, include field-based experiences in these respects not that much different from good traditional programs.
   c. Differ from traditional programs most apparent in:
      (1) The form and frequency of student/program accountability built into the training system
      (2) Emphasis placed on empirically-based program revision
      (3) Few programs highly developed in these areas.

C. Program evaluation data
1. Great variability
   a. Descriptions of evaluation plans
   b. Evaluation designs
   c. Results reported
2. Content of evaluation
   a. Implied progression from knowledge acquisition to performance in natural setting - does not necessarily produce a hierarchy of skill attainment
3. Results
   a. Gross
   b. Summarized form
   c. Attitudinal data used for justification of program effectiveness
   d. Very few report pupil change data for criteria of program effectiveness
   e. Very few used control groups
   f. Pretest - posttest design popular
   g. Few report reliability data - interrater most reported

4. Evaluation forms
   a. Criterion tests
   b. Opinion surveys
   c. Rating scales

D. Implications

1. Total evaluation is an after thought in program design and implementation
2. Evaluation data most often attitu.. range and percentage levels on CRM's
3. Pupil change data seldom reported
4. Need new comprehensive evaluation paradigms for CBTE training programs.

INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS	PROGRAM	NUMBER	PAGE
	CBTE-Workshop	1b	1 of 4

COMPONENT	MODULE
CBTE-Mastery Session (Part I)	CBTE in Special Education: New Direction in Federal Funding and Research Priorities

COMPETENCY

The participant will be able to demonstrate knowledge of new or innovative CBTE programs, trends and priorities in federal funding and current research emphasis in the CBTE area.

RATIONALE

Knowledge of the national trends, innovations, funding priorities and research needs and research in process will significantly assist other professionals involved in CBTE program development.

OBJECTIVES

1. To present the inadequacies inherent to extant research environments.
   a. Teacher behavior research
   b. Teacher training research
   c. Teacher training demonstration projects
2. To describe inadequacies in current funding patterns.
3. To present some recommendations for the revision of federal organization and funding patterns to facilitate the emergence of comprehensive, theoretically sound, programmatic research efforts and the evolution of optimal, validated training environments.
4. To present recommendations for the research community related to the use of optimal methodological strategies.
5. To present a set of priorities for specific research paradigms which should yield maximum payoff in terms of critical teacher behavior and pupil-teacher interaction patterns.

PREREQUISITES

Completion of Mastery Session - Part I.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA	PROGRAM	NUMBER	PAGE
	CBTE-Workshop	1b	2 of 4

The participant will be evaluated concerning the process aspects of the module but not specific product assessment will be made, i.e., posttest.

The evaluation procedures will be the same as outlined in the Evaluation of Workshop handout attached to the workshop packet.

LEARNING ACTIVITIES AND ALTERNATIVES

The information dissemination will consist of lecture/discussion and explanation of graphic data displays.

The continued evolution of CBTE in special education: the need for new directions in federal support and research priorities.

I. The empirical base: why it has eluded us.

A. Teacher behavior research

1. Fragmented
2. One-short efforts

B. Teacher training research

1. Focus
   a. Acquisition of training procedures
   b. Internal/transfer validation
   c. Minimal assessment in terms of pupil growth criteria

C. Teacher training demonstration projects

1. Description of comprehensive programs
2. No clear delineation of relationships among training variables
3. Reflect accidental correspondence to research findings
4. Evaluation is subjective, piecemeal

II. The impirical base: the federal role, consequences, and recommendations

A. The funding pattern

1. Short term
2. Product-oriented
3. Marginal quality research products

B. Recommendations

1. Long term commitments to programmatic and longitudinal research.
2. Support for basic, theoretical, taxonomic and model building research efforts.
3. Establishment of appropriate monitoring procedures
   a. Not competitive with funded project objectives
   b. Responsive to project director's needs
   c. Clear statement of the extent and duration of the federal support
4. Coordinated planning at the federal agency level
   a. Division of Innovation and Development
   b. Division of Personnel Development
   c. Teacher Corps
   d. N.I.E.
   e. ALRC/RRC network

III. The empirical base: recommendations for the research community

A. Needs assessment

1. Identification of evidence which constitutes criteria for assessing pupil growth

2. Multiple group input
   a. Parents
   b. Teachers
   c. Administrators
   d. Legislators

B. Development activities/criterion variable construction

1. Achievement measures commensurate with pupil and curricula characteristics.
2. Achievement measures which assess growth in nonacademic areas.
3. Fine-grain assessment tools - observation systems.
4. Interviewing techniques - perception discrepancy analyses.

IV. Recommended priorities for teacher behavior research in special education.

A. Presage-related research

1. Presage studies
   a. Teacher variables (low)
   b. Pupil variables (N/A)
   c. Teacher-pupil variables (medium-low)
2. Presage-process
   a. Teacher variables (M-L)
   b. Pipil variables (N/A)
   c. Teacher-pupil variables (M-L)
3. Presage-produce
   a. Teacher variables (L)
   b. Pupil variables (L)
   c. Teacher-pupil variables (L)

B. Process-related research

1. Process studies
   a. Teacher variables (M)
   b. Pupil variables (N/A)
   c. Teacher-pupil variables (H)
2. Process-product
   a. Teacher variable (M-L)
   b. Pupil variables (N/A)
   d. Teacher-pupil variables (H+)

C. Product-related research

1. Presage-Process-Product research
   a. Teacher variables (ML)
   b. Pupil variables (N/A)
   c. Teacher-pupil variables (H+)
2. Product-research
   a. Teacher variables (ML)
   b. Pupil variables (N/A)
   c. Teacher-pupil variables (M)

INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS	PROGRAM	NUMBER	PAGE
	CBTE-Workshop	1c	1 of 3

COMPONENT	MODULE
CBTE-Mastery Session (Part II)	An Operational Game: A CBTE Program... What It Should Look Like and How Do You Know You Have One

COMPETENCY

Upon completion of this module, the participant will be knowledgeable of the characteristics of CBTE programs having demonstrated effectiveness; evaluation procedures for CBTE programs and the operation of strategies to achieve consensus with divergent groups interacting in a CBTE program.

RATIONALE

Knowledge of recognized characteristics of CBTE programs having documented effectiveness, assessment procedures and achieving program consensus among divergent groups within a CBTE endeavor are essential to continued CBTE program development, innovation and evaluation.

OBJECTIVES

1. To provide participants an opportunity to specify the most desirable characteristics of a CBTE program.

2. To provide participants an opportunity to generate strategies for assessing the extent to which desirable characteristics are present in any given program -- an operational checklist.

3. To demonstrate a strategy for facilitating divergent group consensus through the use of an operational game format.

PREREQUISITES

Completion of Parts I and II of Mastery Session.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA	PROGRAM	NUMBER	PAGE
	CBTE-Workshop	1c	2 of 3

The participant will be evaluated concerning the process aspects of the module but not specific product assessment will be made, i.e., posttest.

The evaluation procedures will be the same as outlined in the Evaluation of Workshop handout attached to the workshop packet.

LEARNING ACTIVITIES AND ALTERNATIVES

The information dissemination will consist of lecture/discussion and explanation of graphic data displays.

CONTENT OUTLINE	PROGRAM	NUMBER	PAGE
	CBTE-Workshop	1c	3 of 3

The participant will be provided basic information relevant to the stated objective on page one through a lecture/discussion and audio-visual process. In addition, an operation game will be played involving active participation of all 6 module members.

INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS	PROGRAM	NUMBER	PAGE
	CBTE Workshop	2	1 of 6

COMPONENT	MODULE
CBTE - PUBLISHED NARRATIVE FORMAT	Writing Instructional Modules from Published Narrative

COMPETENCY

The participant will be able to design a competency-based instructional module in which the major content is presented via a published narrative.

RATIONALE

Printed material constitutes one of the most effective and efficient means of providing instruction. However, this material seldom is organized in a format specifically compatible with competency-based instruction. Published narratives such as journal articles, book chapters, etc. consequently must be adapted to this format.

OBJECTIVES

After completing this module the participant should be able to adapt published narrative material to a competency-based format, including:

1. Writing behavioral objectives over the material
2. Listing prerequisites (entering behaviors) to the module or narrative
3. Developing a content outline from the narrative and supplementary sources of information (lectures, films, etc.)
4. Specifying alternative learning activities for the module
5. Developing appropriate evaluation procedures and criteria
6. Listing references and resources to be used in the module

PREREQUISITES

1. The participant should have basic knowledge of competency-based instruction.
2. The participant should be able to write behavioral objectives.

CONTENT OUTLINE	PROGRAM	NUMBER	PAGE
	CBTE Workshop	2	2 of 6

I. Components of Instructional Design Specifications Format

II. Simulation:

A. Read Franks article

B. Bill out Instructional Design Specifications forms

C. Demonstrate each component

III. Discussion

A. Ways in which published material can be modified or supplemented

1. Probes

2. Branching

3. Posttests

4. Autoinstructional versus instructor-mediated

B. Precautious in using previously published material

C. Questions

IV. Session Evaluation

I. Simulation: Given a description of the component, module, and competency, and a statement of the rationale, each participant will:

A. Read Frank's article

B. Write a set of behavioral objectives covering the material

C. List student prerequisites for entry into the module

D. Write a content outline of the material

E. List at least two alternate learning activities

F. Design appropriate evaluation procedures and criteria

G. A reference list will be provided

II. Demonstration - group leader will illustrate each step in the above process

III. Discussion

IV. Session Evaluation

The participant will be evaluated concerning the process aspects of the module but not specific product assessment will be made, i.e., posttest.

The evaluation procedures will be the same as outlined in the Evaluation of Workshop handout attached to the workshop packet.

Arthur, K. "Diagnosis" and "treatment" in remedial education - A review paper. Slow Learning Child, 1974, 21, (2), 114-134.

Bateman, B. D. The essentials of teaching. San Rafael, California: Dimensions Publishing, 1971.

Boehm, A. E. Criterion-referenced assessment for the teacher. Teacher's College Record, 1973, 75, (1), 117-126.

Brodt, D. E. Task analysis for the development of audiovisual programmed instruction modules. Audiovisual Instruction, 1973, 18, (9), 8-11.

Caruso, J. L. & Resnick, L. B. Task structure and transfer in children's learning of double classification skills. Child Development, 1972, 43, 1297-1308.

Cunningham, D. J. Task analysis and part versus whole learning methods. AV Communication Review, 1971, 19, 365-398.

Davies, I. K. Task analysis: Some process and content concerns. AV Communication Review, 1973, 21, (1), 73-86.

Frank, A. R. Breaking down learning tasks: A sequence approach. Teaching Exceptional Children, 1973, 6, (1), 16-19.

Freda, L. J., & Loolioan, J. K. Task analysis as the training determinator: One organization's approach. Educational Technology, 1975, 15, (9), 22-27.

Hakim, C. S. Task analysis: One alternative. Academic Therapy Quarterly, 1974-1975, 10, 201-209.

Hand, B. Task analysis in developing performance objectives. Business Education Forum, 1975, 29, (8), 12-13.

Hannum, W. H. Toward a framework for task analysis. Educational Technology, 1974, 14, (2), 57-58.

Junkala, J. Task analysis and instructional alternatives. Academic Therapy Quarterly, 1972, 8, (1), 33-40.

Knapczyk, D. R. Task analytic assessment of severe learning problems. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 1975, 10, (2), 74-77.

Martin, M. C., & Brodt, D. E. Task analysis for training and curriculum design. Improving Human Performance, 1973, 2, (2), 113-120.

Merrill, M. D. Content and instructional analysis for cognitive transfer tasks. AV Communication Review, 1973.

Okey, J. R. Tasks of instruction. Educational Leadership, 1971, 28, 381-384.

Resnick, L. B., Wang, M. C., & Kaplan, J. Task analysis in curriculum design: A hierarchically sequenced introductory mathematics curriculum. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1973, 6, 679-710.

Rhetts, J. E. Task, learner, and treatment variables in instructional design. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1974, 66, 339-347.

Sherrill, J. L. Analysis approaches in instructional design. Educational Technology, 1972, 12, (8), 42-45

Siegel, E. Task analysis and effective teaching. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1972, 5, (10), 519-532.

Siegel, E., & Siegel, R. Ten guidelines for writing instructional sequences. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1975, 8, 203-209.

Skarbek, J. F. Diagnostic analysis of mathematics skills. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Yearbook, 1972, 35, 513-516.

Stephens, W. E. Equivalence formation by retarded and nonretarded children in structured and unstructured tasks. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1973, 77, 445-450.

Stewart, K. Two approaches to handwriting instruction. Slow Learning Child, 1973, 20, (3), 142-146.

Tawney, J. W. Task analysis. (Course narrative, Draft No. 2). University of Kentucky, College of Education, Department of Special Education, 1974.

Thiagarjan, S., Semmel, D., & Semmel, M. Instructional development for training teachers of exceptional children: A sourcebook. Minneapolis: Joint publication of the Leadership Training Institute/Special Education, University of Minnesota; The Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped (CITH), Indiana University; The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC); and the Teacher Education Division of CEC.

Valett, R. E. Developmental task analysis and psychoeducational programming. Journal of School Psychology, 1972, 10, 127-133.

Wilson, R. M. Comprehension diagnosis via task analysis. Reading World, 1975, 14, (3), 178-179.

Yaney, J. P. A critical review of the instructional technology mechanism of task analysis. Improving Human Performance, 1974, 3, (2), 64-70.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Salvia, J. Diagnostic-prescriptive teaching: Two models. Exceptional Children, 1974, 41, (3), 181-185.

INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS	PROGRAM	NUMBER	PAGE
	CBTE-Workshop	3	1 of 3

COMPONENT	MODULE
CBTE Auto-Instructional Mediated Module	Format: Professor Developed Mediated

COMPETENCY

Teacher trainer will design and produce a mediated CBTE module to match an instructional objective.

RATIONALE

Teacher trainers should be able to develop mediated modules because the use of mediated instructional materials can:

1. Add interest and motivation for the student
2. Give the student practice in applying a skill in a situation which more closely approximates a real-life situation than does a print format.

Teacher trainers also need to be able to systematically integrate existing mediated materials into an objective-based curriculum.

OBJECTIVES (Enabling)

Teacher trainer will be able to:

1. Describe mediated CBI format.
2. Explain three advantages of using mediated modules.
3. List and describe the components of mediated module format.
4. List the steps involved in designing and producing a mediated module.

PREREQUISITES

Basic media production skills or access to a media specialist.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA

Standard evaluation format will be used.

CONTENT OUTLINE	PROGRAM	NUMBER	PAGE
	CBTE-Workshop	3	2 of 3

For Learning Activity #1: Oral Presentation: (See Next Page)

A. Advantages of mediated materials

1. high interest/motivation
2. allows for individualization - choice of best input mode
3. simulates real-life situation more closely than print

B. General problems

1. random use of media
2. selection of materials first then objectives
3. one-way communication process

C. Overcoming problems

1. systematic selection and use
2. select objective first
3. provide active response mode for learner and feedback device

D. When and why to use media

1. guidelines
2. examples

E. Which medium

1. guidelines
2. examples

F. Selecting and adapting mediated materials

1. guidelines for selection
2. ways to adapt with examples

G. Development of mediated materials to meet instructional objectives.

1. examples

H. Steps in development of mediated module

1. select objective(s)
2. write rationale
3. describe prerequisites
4. describe evaluation procedures
5. plan learning activities
6. develop/select/adapt mediated material

LEARNING ACTIVITIES AND ALTERNATIVES	PROGRAM CBTE-Workshop	NUMBER 3	PAGE 3 of 3

1. Attend oral presentation by section instructor covering following points.

   A. Advantages of use of mediated materials in CBTE instruction.

   B. General problems associated with mediated instruction.

   C. Overcoming problems of mediated instruction (listed in B.) in relation to CBTE.

   D. Why and when to use non-print media to supplement print materials.

   E. Matching the purpose of instruction with appropriate mediated format.

   F. Selection and adaptation of mediated materials to meet instructional objec objectives.

   G. Development of mediated materials to meet instructional objectives.

   H. Steps in the development of a mediated instructional module.

2. Complete an instructor-designed mediated module to teach one method of task analysis.

3. Participate in a short question and answer period upon completion of module.

4. Participate in evaluation of session.

REFERENCES AND RESOURCES

Baker, R.L. and Schutz, R.E. (Eds.). Instructional product development. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1971.

Thiagarajan, S., Semmel, D.S. and Semmel, M.I. Instructional development for training teachers of exceptional children: A sourcebook. Minneapolis: Council for Exceptional Children, 1974.

INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS	PROGRAM	NUMBER	PAGE
	CBTE-Workshop	4	1 of 3

COMPONENT	MODULE
CBTE Auto-Instructional Narrative Format	Professor Written Narrative Format

COMPETENCY

After completing this module the teacher trainer will design and write a narrative-type module that would assist students in mastering a teacher competency.

RATIONALE

Frequently teacher trainers wish to develop in their students skills or concepts that are not covered in textbooks, journal articles or existing modules. In these cases it is imperative that the trainer be able to write narrative-type modules for accomplishing specific instructional objectives.

OBJECTIVES

After completing this module the teacher trainer will:

1. Describe the programmed and periodic probe types of narratives.
2. Explain the advantages and disadvantages of each form of narrative.
3. Identify the form most appropriate for various objectives.
4. List the steps in writing each type of narrative.

PREREQUISITES

NONE

EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA	PROGRAM	NUMBER	PAGE
	CBTE-Workshop	3	2 of

Standard Evaluation Format used.

I. Description of Formats

A. Programmed

1. Frames included
2. Student makes active responses periodically
3. May be linear or branching

B. Periodic probe

1. Written in textual format
2. Student makes active responses less frequently

II. Advantages and Disadvantages

A. Programmed

1. Advantages
   a. Student must attend more closely and respond more frequently
2. Disadvantages
   a. Difficult to produce.
   b. Students may lose interest in long module

B. Periodic probe

1. Advantages
   a. More easily written
2. Disadvantages
   a. Student responds less frequently

III. Appropriateness

A. Programmed

1. Most appropriate for objectives in which one answer is correct

B. Periodic probe

1. Appropriate for objectives in which one answer is correct.
2. Appropriate for objectives in which various answers are correct

IV. Steps in Writing

A. Programmed

1. Write criterion frames and sequence.
2. Write teaching frames to develop mastery of next criterion frame

B. Periodic probe

1. Write criterion referenced test.
2. Write text to permit mastery of test.

LEARNING ACTIVITIES AND ALTERNATIVES	PROGRAM	NUMBER	PAGE
	CBTE-Workshop	4	3 of 3

1. Attend oral presentation by section instructor covering following points:
   A. Description of each type of format
   B. Advantages and disadvantages of each format.
   C. Type of content for which each format is appropriate.
   D. Steps involved in writing the two types of narratives.
2. Complete an instructor-designed module integrating the two types of narrative formats.
3. Participate in short question-answer period upon completion of module.
4. Participate in evaluation of session.

REFERENCES AND RESOURCES

Baker, R.L. and Schutz, R.E. (Eds.). Instructional product development. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1971.

Thiagarajan, S., Semmel, D.S. and Semmel, M.I. Instructional development for training teachers of exceptional children: A sourcebook. Minneapolis: Council for Exceptional Children, 1974.

WORKSHOP EVALUATION INSTRUMENTATION

(Not including long-term questionnaire)

EVALUATIVE MODEL

Workshop Components

	Process	Content
Between Session Questionaire	5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11.	1, 2, 3, 4, 7.
Post-Workshop Questionaire	5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13,	1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 14,
Observation	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.	1.
Long Term Questionaire		

Questionaire Item #'s

Source:

GROUP:
MODULE:
LEADER:
RATER:

GROUP OBSERVATIONS

(1) ATTENTION: (1 min. samples)

ON TASK BEHAVIOR: ATT. TO LEADER, MATERIAL, MEDIA

% on Task

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

(2) Did group members favor certain positions or notions over others?

_____

_____

(3) Did group members overlook individual positions on certain issues?

_____

(4) Did group members attend inappropriately to positions other than those of group consensus?_____

_____

(5) Did group develop its own leadership? _____

_____

(6) Was leadership either too didactic or too vague? _____

_____

(7) Did group have difficulty in reaching desired outcomes and objectives?

_____

_____

(8) Were there problems in cooperation/competition with the group? ___

_____

_____

BETWEEN SESSION QUESTIONAIRE

NAME: MODULE: GROUP LEADER:

Directions: Rate the following aspects of this module as adequate or inadequate by circling one of the numbers displayed below. The higher the positive/negative number, the greater the degree of adequacy/inadequacy, respectively. Circle the appropriate rating and provide comments or suggestions when necessary.

Inadequate			Adequate					Comments/Suggestions
-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(1)	Learning objectives clear	
-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(2)	Learning objectives appropriate for needs	
-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(3)	Content appropriate for meeting stated objectives	
-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(4)	Learning objectives were met	
-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(5)	Media appropriate for transmitting content	
-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(6)	Media technically sound	
-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(7)	Materials helpful to learning	
-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(8)	Workshop staff helpful to learning	
-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(9)	Group size appropriate	
-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(10)	Group dynamics helpful to learning	
-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	(11)	Module evaluation procedures unobtrusive	

POST-SESSION QUESTIONAIRE

NAME_____ MODULES ATTENDED_____,_____,_____

DIRECTIONS: Rate the following overall aspects of this module as adequate or inadequate by circling one of the numbers displayed below. The higher the positive/negative number, the greater the degree of adequacy/inadequacy, respectively. Circle the appropriate rating and provide comments or suggestions when necessary.

INADEQUATE	ADEQUATE			COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(1)	Learning objectives clear	
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(2)	Learning objectives appropriate for needs	
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(3)	Content appropriate for meeting stated objectives	
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(4)	Learning objectives were met	
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(5)	Media appropriate for transmitting content	
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(6)	Media technically sound	
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(7)	Materials helpful to learning	
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(8)	Workshop staff helpful to learning	
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(9)	Group size appropriate	
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(10)	Group dynamics helpful to learning	

INADEQUATE	ADEQUATE			COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(11)	Module evaluation procedures unobtrusive	
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(12)	Overall pace of modules	
-3 -2 -1	+ 1 +2 +3	(13)	Workshop evaluation procedures unobtrusive	
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(14)	Overall content helpful, professionally	